

108



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,040	02/20/2002	Peter L. Ryan	RU-0176	6411

7590 05/19/2004  
Licata & Tyrrell P.C.  
66 E. Main Street  
Marlton, NJ 08053

EXAMINER
----------

DAVIS, DEBORAH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1641

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

10/079,040

Applicant(s)

RYAN ET AL.

Examiner

Deborah A Davis

Art Unit

1641

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See attached.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

LONG V. LE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

05/15/04

## **ADVISORY ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 3-29-04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argue that the instant invention is not anticipated by Stewart et al because the drug oxytocin is not used for treatment to maintain pregnancy or promote relaxin production.

This argument is not found persuasive because the reference of Stewart et al teaches that mares stimulated to deliver with oxytocin showed an elevation in relaxin levels wherein the sensitivity to oxytocin appears to develop late in gestation, as mares induced to abort (problematic pregnancy) in midpregnancy did not show a rise in relaxin (page 651, column 2, paragraph 2).

Applicant argue that the reference of Stewart et al do not teach or suggest methods to use plasma relaxin levels to predict troubled births.

This argument is not found persuasive because, as applicant has already acknowledged, the reference of Stewart et al pointed out the need to study a larger population of mares in order to determine if relaxin concentrations are predictive of an adverse pregnancy outcome. Further, this teaching is also what the instant invention is drawn to, a method for "predicting" a treatment in pregnant mares affected by a disease or condition that alters placental function and results in a problematic pregnancy or delivery.

Art Unit: 1641

Applicant argue that the reference of Stewart et al does not teach each of steps a-c of claim 1 as required by MPEP 2131.

This argument is not found persuasive because Stewart et al teaches all of the steps a, b and c that was discussed in the previous office action.

As for reasons aforementioned above and in the previous office action, this rejection is hereby maintained.